

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,551	ANDRUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Ouellette	3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette.

(3) Melissa Martinez.

(2) David E. A. Jordan.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: McFarlane et al. (US 2002/0111887 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Jordan and Ms. Martinez explained the general concept of the instant invention. Mr. Jordan further presented a proposed amendment (see attached) to overcome the prior art of McFarlane. Examiner Ouellette indicated that the proposed amendment did not narrow the independent claim sufficiently to overcome the prior art of McFarlane. Examiner Ouellette further indicated that the prior art of McFarlane clearly discloses the broad concept of gathering data and organizing data into/by metrics (Table 1, red or yellow indicates high resource use area, which obviously equates to high business cost). Examiner Ouellette indicated incorporating more specific elements (metric formulas, etc.) from the specification into the independent claims to overcome the prior art.